HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLIV APRIL, 1951 NUMBER 2

COLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

ALONG HIGHWAYS AND BYWAYS

MORTON S. ENSLIN
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

FROM ITS earliest beginnings Christianity has always believed itself to be the religion of a book, or to phrase it perhaps a bit more exactly, has had a Bible which it regarded as unique and directly inspired, if not actually written, by God himself. This confidence has always been central and unwavering. But the book has gone through many editions and has shown amazing differences.

During the first hundred years of Christian development, that is, until well toward the middle of the second century, this Bible was essentially what we call today the Old Testament. Christianity had started as a phase or sect of Judaism and had naturally seen in its precious book a justification and blueprint of its own movement. As the years moved on and the movement became more and more established on gentile soil, as increasingly it came to be regarded and eventually to regard itself, as alien to and distinct from the religion of the Synagogue, it clung the more tenaciously to its inherited scripture. Jewish protest, often scandalized and indignant, that the new movement had appropriated and was misusing what was not its own fell on deaf ears. On the contrary, it was insisted, these writings were uniquely theirs. Theirs were the promises and prophecies emblazoned on its every page. Through the earlier centuries the Jews had misappropriated, as well as misunderstood, what was in veriest truth never theirs at all.

But even in those early days of first beginnings there were differences of opinion as to the exact size of their all-precious book, for alongside the Hebrew texts which had eventually, if successively, gained the sanctity of canonization were others which had not then attained — nor ever were to attain in subsequent generations in Jewish eyes — this status. Nonetheless they were a part of the sacred book in its Greek translation and as such were re-

garded by the great majority of Greek-speaking Christians as unquestioned parts of the Bible. That such was the case for the Christians — often styled "Judaizers" — whose background and development were different and who eventually came to be increasingly suspicious of the laxity of their fellows with regard to inroads from the gentile world is far less likely. But this segment of the growing church became increasingly negligible, both in numbers and in actual influence.

While occasional dissent may be found, it is surely safe to say that by and large those writings found in the Septuagint, but not in the Hebrew Bibles, and which are known today as "The Apocrypha," were regarded as unquestioned parts of the scripture. In some lists they might be classed as "ecclesiastical" rather than "canonical"; nonetheless they were to be read and were of the profoundest value, for they too were divinely inspired. Again and again they are cited with precisely the same word of solemn introduction: "It stands written" or "The scripture says." When Tertullian or Origen or Augustine stigmatizes this writing or that as "apocryphal," he is not referring to these at all. Eventually this term was applied to them, no longer in its original sense of "hidden" or "secret," but rather as meaning "false" or "spurious." This was the practice of Jerome who, in consequence of his studies of the Hebrew scriptures in preparation for his own translation of them into Latin, had come to regard these writings which were not in the Hebrew canon with marked disfavor.[1] Despite Jerome's strictures they long continued among the writings styled by the

[1] In his so-called "Prologus galeatus" (Praefat. in libr. Samuel et Malachim — Migne, P. L., XXVIII, pp. 555 f.), after listing the twenty-two books in the Hebrew canon (*viginti et duas litteras . . . apud Hebraeos*) he concludes with the oft-quoted words: *"Hic prologus Scriptuarum, quasi galeatum principium omnibus libris, quos de Hebraeo vertimus in Latinum, convenire potest: ut scire valeamus quidquid extra hos est inter ἀπόκρυφα esse ponendum. . . ."* Frequently he speaks disparagingly of them. For example, in Liber contra Vigilantium 6 (Migne, P. L., XXIII, pp. 344 f.) he refers to a *librum apocryphum qui sub nomine Esdrae*, and dismisses it contemptuously as not received by the church (*quod ecclesia non recipit*). He warns Laeta (Ep. cvii, 12 — Migne, P. L., XXII, p. 877) to avoid all apocryphal writings (*multaque his admixta vitiosa, et grandis esse prudentiae aurum in luto quaerere*). His translation of these non-Hebrew writings was a most indifferent and hasty performance. But "apocrypha" for Jerome included in addition to these writings noncanonical Christian books as well (*Barnabas Cyprius . . . ad aedificationem ecclesiae pertinentem epistulam composuit, quae inter apocrypha legitur* — De Vir. Inl. 6 [Migne, P. L., XXVIII, pp. 555 f.]).

Council of Carthage "canonicae scripturae." In the sixteenth century, however, their dethronement in Protestant (but not Catholic) circles began. First they were collected to form an appendix to the Old Testament and were labelled "Apocrypha"; gradually they disappeared from more and more printed Bibles.[2]

But during the first hundred years of Christian beginnings other books too were regarded in essentially the same light, i.e., as scripture, at least in certain circles. For example, the Book of Enoch is not only referred to but quoted in Jude (14 f.) as inspired scripture, is quoted in II Pet. 2:4 and not improbably also in I Pet. 3:19. Or again, as Origen observed,[3] the Assumption of Moses is quoted in Jude 9. Nor would a student of the New Testament have any difficulty in referring to numerous other quotations which are almost certainly to be ascribed to other books than those we recognize as properly in the canon of Hebrew scriptures. The same situation is found in the early fathers. Thus to mention but two examples of the many which the student of these writings will recall, Clement of Rome cites a passage to us otherwise unknown with the words: "And the master of the universe himself spoke with an oath concerning repentance . . . and added a gracious utterance."[4] Later in the same writing (23:3 f.) there is another quotation which is also quoted in II Clem. 11:2. Some have conjectured that it comes from the lost Book of Eldad and Modad which is cited by name and quoted in the Shepherd of Hermas.[5]

This material, too familiar to require further amplification, must suffice as evidence for the contention with which this paper opened that the first generations of Christians found themselves equipped with a collection of sacred scriptures but that from the earliest days there was no precise agreement as to its limits. The one point about which no legitimate question can be raised is that it was farthest from their minds that a new crop of distinct,

[2] For a recent discussion of these books — their history and the probable reason they were never regarded by orthodox Jewry as canonical — see S. Zeitlin, "Jewish Apocryphal Literature" in Jewish Quarterly Review, XL, 3 (January, 1950), pp. 223–250.

[3] De Princ. iii, 2, 1.

[4] I Clem. 8:2 f.

[5] Vis. ii, 3, 4.

Christian scriptures was necessary. Such a thought would have scandalized them, as it would most of their present-day descendants. They had a Bible in which on every page they were predicted and empowered.

Eventually, as everyone knows, new writings were produced and came to be regarded as the years went by as part of the Christian Bible. The story has been told too frequently to need rehearsal here. Suffice it to say that as these writings were produced — letters from Paul to his churches from which he was at the moment absent; other writings superficially similar in outward form, suggested in no small part by Paul's earlier correspondence, and now intended for all Christians into whose hands they might fall, and attributed to earlier Christians long since dead; a still different type of writings, speedily known as gospels, and which, though written far later than the practical and personal letters of Paul, were devoted to the earlier days when Jesus was here among men — their several writers, however seriously they took their task, never conceived themselves as writing chapters in the Bible or even amplifying or expanding God's Holy Word. The latter was all-inclusive, all-sufficient. Nor were they writing for posterity. There would be no posterity. Speedily the long-deferred promise of God would be realized, the long-expected day would dawn; and in the Kingdom, even as there would be no marrying or giving in marriage, there would be no making or reading of books.

But, as has often been piously and sententiously observed, "Man proposes, God disposes." Eventually a considerable number of these later writings came to a position which none of their authors or early readers had remotely conceived. They came to be regarded as equal with, finally even superior to, those earlier books which God had produced. Although the fascinating and ever-new story of how this all happened is beyond the purpose of this present essay, it is not out of place to remark that the net result of any such study can scarcely fail to leave the student increasingly convinced of both the intrinsic values in these later writings which caused them to achieve their destiny and the consecrated common sense of our earlier brethren who came gradually to see and prize what was of perennial value. For — it can

never be repeated too often — it was due to the increasing fondness for them felt by individual Christians and groups of Christians, not to the dictates or pronouncements of dignitaries or councils that Part II of our Bible came so to be regarded. Ecclesiastical dignitaries, acting alone or in councils, are alike in at least one respect in every age: rarely do they set fashions. They simply affirm in ponderous tones what the majority of their constituents are taking — and have long taken — for granted. But these twenty-seven writings which eventually came to be regarded as divinely inspired, dictated in sober literalness by God, and thus uniquely worthy of their status as Holy Scripture, were not the only writings which Christians produced, which were in form and external appearance at least, of essentially the same sort.

Although many of these writings, conveniently styled the "Apocryphal New Testament," have been published and have prompted many useful volumes and essays, many misconceptions about them still persist. It was formerly customary to include in this collection the so-called Apostolic Fathers.[6] While at first blush this might seem legitimate and natural — analogous to the collection of Old Testament Apocrypha — it has been largely and properly abandoned as unwise and positively misleading. By no stretch of the imagination can any of them be properly styled "apocryphal." The Shepherd of Hermas may well be pseudepigraphical, that is, not written by a man named Hermas as it claims to be. Not even this is to be said of I and II Clement or Barnabas, since all three of them, like our gospels, are anonymous. All of these writings — in addition to these four and the letters of Ignatius are usually included the Didache, the Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians, the Martyrdom of Polycarp, and the Epistle to Diognetus — were highly regarded by early Christians. Not only are some of them listed in several of the early canons, but four of them are actually found in New Testament manuscripts: Barnabas and Hermas in Codex ℵ (Sinaiticus), I and II Clement in

[6] In 1672 Cotelier published a collection of the works of "the holy fathers who flourished in the days of the apostles" (*Patres aevi apostolici sive SS. Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerant*). Since then it has been common practice to group them together and to refer to them by the not too happy title "Apostolic Fathers."

Codex A (Alexandrinus). Thus one will hardly err in believing that several of these — almost certainly I Clement and Barnabas; not improbably Hermas — were regarded at an early period as actually part of the New Testament, that is, as definitely inspired of God and thus essentially scripture.

I have mentioned what the Apocryphal New Testament is not; it is now time to suggest what it is. The initial statement of content is comparatively easy, is in sober literalness the only easy statement one can make in a subject especially thorny and obscure. The Apocryphal New Testament or New Testament Apocrypha consists of a host of books of all sorts: gospels, acts, epistles, and apocalypses — that is, books similar, at least externally, to the several kinds of writings in our canonical New Testament. They are of very different values and of very different dates, ranging in fact from the second century to the present day, for the well has as yet not run dry.

Nor is it an oversimplification to style them all as "religious." Many of them are trivial, some are highly theatrical, some are disgusting, even loathesome; nonetheless they may properly be styled "religious." Their purpose, with a very few possible exceptions, was to enforce what was to the particular writer sound Christian beliefs. This at times takes the form of revealing new doctrines, new truths; of extolling or dilating upon some particular virtue or kind of life; of emphasizing and embroidering some spectacular doctrine such as the virgin birth, the physical resurrection, the second coming of Christ, the future state with special attention to the torments and tortures of the damned; and, perhaps most conspicuous of all, of amplifying laconic and intriguing incidents or details and, on the authority of big names from the past, filling in certain "gaps" or "silences" or answering questions raised or at least suggested by the earlier writings.

Some were definitely the products of sects ranging all the way from reasonable orthodoxy to what was regarded the rankest and most reprehensible heresy. Many of them are scarcely more than copies — sometimes greatly expanded, sometimes drastically abridged — of earlier writings of a similar stripe. Thus to cite by anticipation two writings about which more will later be said, the so-called Protevangelium and the Gospel of Thomas were

to prove the somewhat unsure foundation for many subsequent infancy gospels.

The more I have worked in this very swampy and at times bottomless morass, the more convinced I have become of one characteristic which most if not all of them share, at least in some degree of remove, and which gives to them a value not always admitted or even recognized: the attempt to amplify the narratives and allusions in the books we now call the New Testament. To put it in a word: I am increasingly convinced of their secondary nature, that they are of the nature properly to be styled a parasite growth.

This has not always been recognized. In fact, the very opposite has occasionally been stated. Thus, to cite but two examples: Oscar Holtzmann in his vigorous and penetrating Leben Jesu (1901) argues at length that the Gospel of the Hebrews, known to us solely by occasional quotations in the fathers, and — as will be suggested later — the subject of almost perennial debate in more modern times, is actually a source of very great value, similar to but completely independent of our Synoptic gospels and possessed of an equal value.[7] In 1935 two English scholars, H. I. Bell and T. C. Skeat, published a papyrus fragment [8] which they argued was from a gospel used by or parallel to one or more of our canonical gospels — at least was independent of them.

To me neither argument has proved convincing. There is no intrinsic reason why a noncanonical gospel should not contain material independent of, even superior to, that in our canonical gospels. Certainly canonicity does not ensure historicity: there would be few gospel critics inclined to demur at this point. And of course the opposite is equally true: noncanonicity does not foreclose either historicity or originality. My skepticism regarding the independence of all these writings — including the two championed by Holtzmann and by Bell and Skeat — is neither theological nor *a priori*; rather it is definitely *a posteriori*. As I have examined and pondered the materials in these several writings, I have become increasingly convinced of their universally secondary nature. Thus while I am quite ready to conceive that

[7] Leben Jesu, pp. 35–39 [Engl. Transl., pp. 46–52].
[8] Fragments of an Unknown Gospel.

they *could* preserve "original" material, the material itself indicates to me that it is not such but is on the contrary definitely artificial amplification — embroidery, imagination, the precise term is not important — of narratives in the canonical writings; and that the origin of their superficially "new" narratives or of their embellishments of "old" ones is not to be sought in other materials which the earlier writers — this is conspicuously the case in the gospels, but it is by no means restricted to them — overlooked or rejected but is to be regarded simply as the consequence of the ingenuity and imagination — sometimes severely sober, more often perfervid — of these authors who sought to squeeze all the juice out of the writings which they knew and obviously admired.

They are nonetheless valuable even if they do not preserve material of a nature to commend itself as historical, for they not only reveal the hopes, imaginations, likes and dislikes of our early brethren, but also throw a light at times not inconsiderable upon our gospels, warning us, if we are wary, of the trap which ever stands ready for the interpreter, namely, the temptation to view the stories of another day through our own eyes rather than through the eyes of those who wrote and first read them. Again and again they do with a broad brush precisely what Matthew and Luke did to the earlier Mark. Their alterations and additions to the familiar stories, their readiness to put words in the mouth of Jesus — all this is no new advance, no blasphemous playing fast and loose with material which was from the first beyond change.

Few modern critics of the gospels would, for example, attempt to maintain that the long and often turgid speeches in the mouth of the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel and the parables and lively utterances of the Jesus of the Synoptics both came unaltered from the same man. Their sensitivity at this point has, it may be remarked, been distinctly heightened by the conclusions reached by psychiatrists who have blundered into this realm of the yesteryears and on the basis of earlier orthodox pronouncements at this point have produced their pathological canvases. The conclusion is obvious: much that is talked today of the sacrosanct quality of Jesus' utterances, that while speeches might be placed in the

mouths of others — even of the disciples — in accord with the well-established practice of ancient writers this was not the case with him, is simply not in line with the facts open to all who will themselves open their eyes. Words *were* put in his mouth, narratives about him *were* changed even if they had once been written in what was later to become Holy Writ.

The point to be borne in mind — and the lavish strokes of the pseudepigraphers aid us in seeing it — is that when these first gospels of ours were first read they were not considered scripture. They were valuable but they were not sacred. They could be added to and changed. They raised questions, aroused curiosity — and their readers sought answers to the questions, sought to stay their curiosity.

A few examples may make this important point clearer. One of the most familiar stories in the apocryphal gospels has to do with the parable of the entrusted funds. It is referred to by Eusebius [9] and is commonly considered to have been a part of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. In this famous story three servants are distinguished: one multiplied his money by trading, one hid it and returned it intact but without increase, one squandered it on harlots and flute-girls. The second received a rebuke; it was to the third that the severe penalty was given. Surely it is unnecessary to see this as a different story or to seek to account for the variations in terms of source analysis. The alteration is a natural one which readily occurs to every reader of the Matthaean parable, caught alike by the penalty, seemingly disproportionate to the guilt, and by the recognition that these two acts — trading and simply holding — were not the only two possible: too often the funds were embezzled. That surely was still more reprehensible. Pious reflection is a quite sufficient source for the alteration. But this variant version in the apocryphon surely tends to make us aware that this was not the first time the story had been so treated. It would seem idle to deny that the Mat-

[9] Theophany (Frg. xxii) in Migne, Patr. Gr. XXIV, 685D. That this Greek fragment is actually a part of the Theophany has been often doubted, nor is it certain to what writing he is referring. Instead of such an introduction as *ἦν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει* (H. E. iii, 39, 17), the words are *ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἦκον Ἑβραϊκοῖς χαρακτῆρσιν εὐαγγέλιον*. Cf. M.-J. Lagrange's "L'Évangile selon les Hébreux" in Revue Biblique, xxxi (1922), pp. 177 f.

thaean parable of the talents and the Lukan parable of the pounds are simply two versions of the same story. And surely the Lukan form is the later, showing precisely the same result of reflection as is found in the third account. Not only is the excessive and unnatural amount of entrusted money lessened — a *mina* must have seemed a far more likely amount than a *talent*: these first-century Christians were not accustomed to the astronomical sums modern governments toss around — but also a definite correction is made. In the Lucan form each servant receives the same amount; the difference in return is thus presumably due to his own acumen. Not so in Matthew. Here one man receives five, the second two, the third only one. Thus not only is the query legitimate: did not the second do as ably as the first? he doubled his money too; in addition another objection lies at hand. Could not the third man retort that he had been unfairly discriminated against, that he had been prejudged as incompetent? Surely the Lucan form meets this objection: God does not play favorites; one may not plead that as an excuse. The point to be observed is that the so-called apocryphal account indicates no new or irresponsible handling of a sacred story. This author is doing precisely the same thing as had the earlier evangelist. And it may also be observed that in both revisions no other source for the new details is to be sought than the quickened imagination of the storyteller.

This latter point is so important that it may well be amplified a bit, even if by anticipation. Any thoughtful reading of the Synoptic gospels must result in one conclusion: even if the ministry was very brief, far more must have been said and done than is here recorded. One may not subscribe in sober literalness to the sententious, if somewhat hyperbolic, observation which ends the Gospel of John: "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." [10] He must agree that we have only a handful of stories. This has been frequently commented upon with seemingly valid conclusions drawn. Thus the statement has often been made that Mark picked and chose his material, selecting only a comparative

[10] John 21:25.

handful of the narratives available. There is just enough truth in this contention to make it dangerous. That Mark's hand is heavy upon his material is too clear to need argument, but this is not the whole story. What evidence do we have, save in the case of resurrection stories, of this often fancied large amount of material available but not utilized by Mark? Here once again we may well have been led astray by the reported fragment of the words of that *ignis fatuus* of the second century, Papias:

> And the presbyter used to say this, "Mark became Peter's interpreter and wrote accurately all that he remembered, not, to be sure, in order(?), of the things said or done by the Lord." For he had neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but later, as I said, followed Peter, who used to give(his) teachings as the need arose but without making an arrangement of the Lord's oracles, so that Mark did nothing at all wrong in thus writing down some things as he remembered them. For for one thing he gave concern, to omit nothing of what he had heard or to falsify anything therein.[11]

I have attempted to show elsewhere [12] that Papias is here apparently contrasting the Gospel of Mark with that of Matthew, which latter he preferred, and is commenting on the comparative brevity of Mark, due not only to the obvious absence of stories dealing with his supernatural birth and resurrection appearances, but also the comparatively small amount of discourse material. Surely the Gospels of Matthew and Luke show amazingly little evidence of independent narratives about Jesus outside of Mark. To be sure, occasionally superficially different stories are found, but in every case they may be plausibly explained as haggadic enlargement, mistletoe attachment, or artificial doublets. That such a story as Peter's walking on the water [13] or the encomium pronounced upon Peter [14] had any existence independent of its Markan base [15] is utterly improbable. Or to take a random example in the fuller Luke: it would certainly be rash to point to such a story as that of the ten lepers,[16] of whom the Samaritan

[11] Eusebius, H. E. iii, 39, 15.
[12] Christian Beginnings, pp. 383 f.
[13] Matt. 14:28 ff.
[14] Matt. 16:17 ff.
[15] Mark 6:45–52; 8:27–33.
[16] Luke 17:11–19.

alone was grateful. Surely here we have a palpable case of a doublet, based on Mark's familiar story [17] and adorned with Lucan touches. That the story had any independent existence is most unlikely.

To a degree the Gospel of John may seem to afford evidence to the contrary. Here are found stories some of which are clearly outside the Synoptic — that is, the Markan — compass. That they are either historic or even primitive is far less certain. Rather they would appear to be the product of reflection and from a comparatively limited and late circle — definitely not stories known to but rejected by Mark.

Thus this easily assumed "host of stories" from which Mark made a limited selection seems scarcely to square with the facts. No subsequent writer seems to know them. Surely Matthew's and Luke's treatment of Mark indicate that though they found it convenient and valuable they stood in no such awe of it as the author of the canonical Apocalypse hoped would be the case with his production.[18] But the hard fact seems to remain that they had no other stories to tell, quite despite the vast research which modern Ph.D.'s, still exhausted from their own labors, like to imagine "Dr. Luke" had also undergone.

And when we turn to the welter of material in the Apocryphal gospels, this conclusion seems the more clear and undebatable. No trace of a story can I find that appears to be a primitive one, outside or independent of the earlier gospels. Rather, in every case they are either embellishments of the earlier stories, combinations and composite fabrications from their elements, or purely imaginative inventions to fill in silent and intriguing gaps. Surely it is not due to any awe of our gospels which led them so conspicuously to refrain from recounting other stories during the ministry. Their complete silence at this point is striking. Rather their field of interest is the years of silence before the ministry began — and primarily when Jesus was a baby or small boy [19] — or in the period following his crucifixion. And even here we search

[17] Mark 1:40–45.

[18] Rev. 22:18 f.

[19] The absence of stories during the eighteen years between his visit to the temple and his public advent is at first surprising. Is this due to the express statement in John 2:11 that the miracle at Cana was the *first* which Jesus wrought?

in vain for the veriest trace of anything primitive which had escaped the notice of the earlier writers. The conclusion seems inevitable: Mark had not only emptied the barrel but had swabbed it dry. This seemingly solid result may well suggest the general nature and limit of Christian preaching in the pre-Markan days which had apparently not tended to utilize and so to preserve in any great degree what may be called primitive material.

Of the flood of parasite writings which were produced in the early years many are known to us only by name or by occasional brief quotations or paraphrases. Not infrequently the references are of a nature to make descriptions and evaluations of them very hazardous. Among such are the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel of the Nazarenes, the Gospel of the Ebionites, the Gospel according to the Egyptians. Regarding the first three of these there has been a very wide difference of opinion expressed by modern investigators. Jerome's claims to have translated the first [20] is not of a sort to arouse much confidence — he claimed the same thing for almost every document he had ever heard of. Epiphanius, our only source of knowledge of the so-called Gospel of the Ebionites, is a weak reed on which to lean. While the matter is far from sure at our present state of knowledge, it is perhaps safest to hazard the guess that these two are the same writing, by no means identical with our Matthew — although this has often been asserted — but heavily dependent upon it. It appears to have been the product of Jewish-Christian thought, to have made James the central figure in sharp and even hostile contradistinction from Paul, to have subordinated Peter to John — this latter was the leader of the Twelve — and thus to evidence the attitude we may reasonably suppose was that of the early Jerusalem group.[21] The Gospel of the Nazarenes, on the other hand, may very well have been a targum of our Greek Matthew. The several quotations in Clement of Alexandria of the Gospel according to the Egyptians suggest that it was of a definitely doctrinal nature —

[20] De Vir. Inlustr. 2; cf. Comm. in Matt. (12:13), Patr. Lat. XXVI, 78D.

[21] This is essentially the position adopted by B. W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew, in the important Appended Note VI ("Mt. and the Jewish-Christian Gospels"), pp. 478–495.

strongly ascetic, not improbably Gnostic. One reference to it by Clement may serve as a sample:

> When Salome asked when the things concerning which she asked should be known, the Lord said: "When ye have trampled on the garment of shame, and when the two become one, and the male with the female is neither male nor female." In the first place, then, we do not have this saying in the four gospels which have been delivered to us, but in that which is according to the Egyptians.[22]

It would not seem necessary to see in this supposed word of Jesus (which is often repeated in subsequent writers) [23] more than an ascetic utterance not improbably suggested by the famous gnomon that in the coming kingdom there will be no marriage nor giving in marriage.[24]

I have already referred to one of the stories in the Gospel according to the Hebrews — the third version of the entrusted funds — and have suggested its secondary nature. One or two others may be mentioned. Clement [25] cites a word, also found in the so-called sayings from Oxyrhynchus: "He will not cease from seeking until he find, and having found, he will be amazed, and having been amazed will reign, and having reigned will rest." Twice Origen [26] cites from this writing a detail, apparently from the temptation story: "Just now my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs and carried me away to the great mountain Tabor." Few will be inclined to question the secondary nature of these words: it is a palpable adaptation of the Markan story, which incidentally was to be drastically revised and amplified by the later Matthew and Luke to answer the question, "How was he tempted?" Instead of Mark's brusk "And straightway the Spirit driveth him forth," [27] which was softened by Matthew and Luke to the more seemly "led," [28] this other version makes use of the famed experience of Ezekiel — "And he put forth the form

[22] Strom. iii, 13, 92.

[23] Cf. M. R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament, p. 11. This volume by James is still the most convenient introduction to this whole welter of writings.

[24] Mark 12:25 and parallels.

[25] Strom. v, 14, 96.

[26] Comment. in Joan. ii, 12 (87); In Jerem. hom. xv, 4.

[27] Mark 1:12.

[28] Matt. 4:1; Luke 4:1.

of a hand, and took me by a lock of my head; and the Spirit lifted me up between earth and heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem . . ." [29] — which had already prompted the similar story about Habakkuk's round trip by air from Judea to Babylon to carry a dinner to Daniel.[30] The other details in the story — the reference to the Holy Spirit as "my mother" and Tabor as the scene of the experience — are also simply mistletoe growth. The Hebrew word *ruaḥ*, is feminine; hence the deduction, "my mother." The Matthaean-Lucan revision of the Markan story features a mountain as the locale of one of the temptations, and had not Matthew actually written that Jesus was "led *up* by the spirit"? [31] The introduction of specific names in the case of persons and places which were unnamed in earlier versions, although strikingly a characteristic of the apocryphal writings, was by no means restricted to them.[31a] The successive revisions by our evangelist [32] of the incident in the Gethsemane story, where the unidentified figure who cut off an ear of the nameless servant of the High Priest became more explicit — it was Peter who cut off the *right* ear of *Malchus* — provide a convenient example of 'how the story grows,' so familiar to every student of folklore, sacred as well as secular.

Several other gospels are also known either from an occasional reference or from quotations. Among such are the Gospel of Philip,[33] the Gospel of Matthias, the Traditions of Matthias,[34] and the Preaching of Peter. We also have early references to the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Peter, but in these cases we have more than occasional quotations. We have a Gospel of Thomas extant in both Greek and Latin which is clearly one of the principal sources for the subsequent infancy gospels, to be mentioned in a moment. It is not absolutely certain that this is

[29] Ezek. 8:3.

[30] Bel and the Dragon 33–39.

[31] Matt. 4:1.

[31a] Cf. my article, "Hagiographic Mistletoe," in Journal of Religion, XXV, 1 (January, 1945), pp. 10–24.

[32] Cf. Mark 14:47; Matt. 26:51; Luke 22:49 ff.; John 18:10.

[33] Epiphanius, Adv. Haer. xxvi, 13, 2.

[34] The former is mentioned by Origen (in Lucam, hom. i) and the latter (παραδόσεις) by Clement (Strom. ii, 45; iii, 4, 26; vii, 13, 82). They may well be the same writing.

the same as the one referred to by such figures as Origen, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, and Cyril of Jerusalem, but M. R. James is probably correct in his view that the two are genetically connected.[35] The Gospel of Peter, on the other hand, is a passion gospel. For centuries it was known only by name, although surmises as to its nature had been occasionally made.[36] In 1884 a large fragment of it was discovered in a tomb at Akhmim which confirmed in a startling manner the earlier conjectures as to its nature and content. Such occurrences do much to meet the too frequent and persistent charges of subjective and irresponsible guesswork indulged in by historians and literary critics.

Then there are other books of an even more heretical nature, most of them scarcely more than names to us. Among such are the Birth of Mary, which, if Epiphanius [37] is to be trusted, must have been a viciously anti-Jewish writing — the reason Zacharias had first been struck dumb and subsequently murdered was that he had seen, while offering the incense, the God of the Jews in the form of an ass; the reason the high priest had been commanded by Moses always to wear bells on his garment was to warn this divinity to hide lest his form be seen —; the Greater Question of Mary of which a singularly indecent excerpt is given by Epiphanius,[38] who apparently relished pointing out nasty details which, as he piously warned, good people should be careful never to look at; the Ascent of James [39] which may well have been anti-Pauline — Paul was a Greek; desiring to wed the daughter of the high priest he got himself circumcised and became a proselyte, but failing to win his bride he became enraged and wrote tirades against the law and circumcision. We also hear of a Gospel of Judas Iscariot [40] and an Ascent of Paul,[41] both of which are said to have been produced by the Cainites.

[35] Op. cit., p. 14. James lists the brief references.

[36] See Eusebius, H. E. vi, 12, 1–6, for the story of Serapion's decision in regard to it.

[37] Adv. Haer. xxvi, 12, 1–9.

[38] Adv. Haer. xxvi, 8, 2 ff. M. R. James in error says that the quotation is from the Lesser Questions. Epiphanius refers to both, but his quotation is from the Greater.

[39] Adv. Haer. xxx, 16, 7; cf. B. W. Bacon, op. cit., pp. 488 ff.

[40] Epiphanius, Adv. Haer. xxxviii, 1, 5; cf. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. i, 31, 1.

[41] Epiphanius, Adv. Haer. xxxviii, 2, 5.

Better known are two other types of writings, the so-called "infancy gospels" and "passion gospels." The origin of both types may safely be ascribed to the desire to fill in the intriguing silences, both before and after the ministry. And here too they had good precedent.

The abrupt beginning of Mark was bound to raise questions just as soon as it came to be read. Quite regardless of what Mark had intended,[42] the narrative of the baptism as told here was bound to suggest that it was at that moment that Jesus became God's Son; furthermore the embarrassing word in Jesus' mouth later in the narrative [43] might easily suggest that Jesus was not of Davidic stock. This would never do. It is not surprising that subsequent gospels — our Matthew and Luke — explicitly correct that infelicity with their stories of the supernatural birth and the Davidic lineage. The subsequent infancy gospels simply carry the story farther, insisting with specific detail that in sober literalness Mary was and remained a virgin even after the birth, and then telling numerous stories of the deeds of Jesus both as an infant and small boy.

Of these gospels two are old — the Book of James, called by its sixteenth-century discoverer, Guillaume Postel, the Protevangelium of James; and the Gospel of Thomas, which, as has just been remarked, may well be an expurgated edition of the book referred to by several of the early writers.

The Protevangelium tells the story of the birth and early years of Mary. Like Samuel — the story is clearly dependent upon this Old Testament narrative — she was born to Anna and Joachim in answer to the bitter prayers of the long-barren woman, and after an angelic visitation reminiscent of the one to the parents of Samson. Mary is dedicated to perpetual virginity and at the age of three is brought to the temple where she is brought up as a sort of Jewish vestal virgin, fed solicitously by angels, until reaching the age of twelve she becomes something of a problem. Then follows the betrothal to Joseph, an elderly widower, selected in consequence of a divine prophecy — from his rod a dove flew out and lighted upon his head. Soon Mary became pregnant; sus-

[42] Cf. my article "The Artistry of Mark" in JBL, LXVI, 4 (1947), pp. 391 ff.
[43] Mark 12:35–37.

picion pointed to Joseph who was actually accused by Annas the scribe. When Mary and Joseph drank the water of conviction with no ill effects, the high priest was convinced of their innocence. Then follows the birth of Jesus in a cave, the testimony of the midwife and Salome that even after the birth Mary was a virgin, and the restoration of Salome's hand which had "fallen away from [her] in fire" because of her unbelief. One detail of no small interest is the story of the miraculous escape of John the Baptist. Sooner or later Christian curiosity was sure to be piqued to account for his escape in the slaughter of the innocents. And here an explanation is provided: John's mother fled with him to the hill country. Upon finding no place of escape, the mother groaned aloud: "O mountain of God, receive thou a mother with a child. . . . And immediately the mountain clave asunder and took her in. And there was a light shining alway for them, for an angel of the Lord was with them, keeping watch over them." The little book ends with the death of Zacharias who was arrested and slain by the officers of the enraged Herod. Thoughtful reading of this not unentertaining narrative will leave most readers convinced not only of the fertile imagination of the author but of his ingenuity in braiding together biblical touches and allusions — a characteristic of all this type of writing and an all-sufficient answer to queries as to sources.

The Gospel of Thomas provides a number of tasteless stories of the marvelous exploits of Jesus as a small boy. Here we have the story of his molding twelve little mud sparrows on the Sabbath and by clapping his hands causing them to fly away to the amazement of the Jew who had chided him for profaning the Sabbath. These savorless and inartistic tales are too well known to need further mention. One and all depict the arrogant little wonder-worker, destitute of all save a high opinion of himself, the miraculous power to wreak vengeance on all who oppose him, and the ability to escape the consequences of his deeds.

These two writings were utilized again and again by subsequent writers, and their contents appear in even more garish form in such works as the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, the Gospel of the Birth of Mary, the Armenian and Arabic Gospels of the Infancy,

the History of Joseph the Carpenter, and many others both mediaeval and modern.

In them all we discover a constant readiness to fill in the silent years through embroidering and expanding earlier and barer stories, or through spinning new ones. The ingenuity, if sadly misused, in using a word here or an allusion there to deck out the garish tales can scarcely fail to recall to the reader the familiar word, "Gather up the fragments that nothing be lost." One turns away from them with an increased appreciation for the chaste silence of our canonical gospels. In contradistinction to these tasteless stories and the evidence of the dangers involved in stress upon the miraculous endowment of their central figure the restrained words of Luke are refreshing: "And the child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him." [44] "And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men." [45] Nevertheless one can scarcely avoid the feeling that it was words such as these which intrigued the later writers and led them to their conjectures both as to the way he "waxed strong" and was "filled with wisdom," and as to the nature of the "grace of God" which was upon him.

Nor can it be denied that these bedizened tales are at times of positive value. For those who have eyes to see they can be very revealing. One example must suffice.

In the Gospel of Luke we have a story which though chastely and delicately told is almost surely not unlike them. It is the story of the visit of the twelve-year-old Jesus to the temple. In part because of the restraint of the narrative, in part because of our unconscious reading into the story our own content, the story has been widely accepted as historical. Many the sermon that has been preached upon it in which is described the sober-eyed youth, now having become a "son of the law," thrilled as he stood in Zion's fabled hall and modestly but ably talked with his elders when most boys of his age were busy with their puerile interests. It is highly probable that despite this pleasing modernization the Gospel of Thomas and the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy are far more correct than was the artist Hoffman in their understanding

[44] Luke 1:80.
[45] Luke 2:40.

of this Lucan narrative. One does not need to be a very profound student of antiquity to see a quite different meaning to this little story. The constant allusions in stories of ancient worthies who as children had given evidence of their coming abilities are not easily brushed aside. One thinks of the stories told of Moses,[46] of Cyrus,[47] of Alexander the Great,[48] of Josephus,[49] of the Egyptian Si-Osiri — to mention but a few. The last of these is so apt that it may well bear repetition:

> The child grew big, he grew strong, he was sent to the school(?) . . . He rivalled the scribe that had been appointed to teach him. The child [Si-Osiri] began to speak . . . with the scribes of the House of Life, in [the temple of Ptah(?); all who heard him were] lost in wonder at him.
>
> Now when the boy Si-Osiri had attained twelve years it came to pass that there was no [good scribe or learned man(?)] that rivalled him in Memphis in reading writing that compels.[50]

The form the Lucan story took in the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy is very revealing. Following, as it does, stories of Jesus with his several schoolmasters and their amazed reports to Joseph, "Thou hast brought to me to be taught a boy more learned than all the masters," and to Mary, "This son of thine has no need of instruction," it stands as the climax of the writing. Though prolix and stodgy it too will bear repetition:

> And when he was twelve years old, they took him to Jerusalem to the feast, And when the feast was finished they indeed returned; but the Lord Jesus remained in the temple among the teachers and elders and learned men of the sons of Israel, to whom he put various questions upon the sciences, and gave answers in his turn. For he said to them: Whose son is the Messiah? They answered him: The son of David. Wherefore then, said he, does he in the Spirit call him his lord, when he says, The lord said to my lord, Sit at my right hand, that I may put thine enemies under thy footsteps? Again the chief of the teachers said to him: Hast thou read the books? Both the books, said the Lord Jesus,

[46] Josephus, Antt. ii, 9, 6 f; Philo, Vit. Mos. i, 5 f.
[47] Herodotus, Hist. i, 114 f.
[48] Plutarch, Alex. 5.
[49] Josephus, Vit. 2.
[50] F. L. Griffith, Stories of the High Priests of Memphis, pp. 44, 50. Griffith dated this papyrus ca. A.D. 80 (p. 41).

and the things contained in the books. And he explained the books, and the law, and the precepts, and the statutes, and the mysteries, which are contained in the books of the prophets — things which the understanding of no creature attains to. The teacher therefore said: I hitherto have neither attained to nor heard of such knowledge: Who, pray, do you think that boy will be?

And a philosopher who was there present, a skilful astronomer, asked the Lord Jesus whether he had studied astronomy. And the Lord Jesus answered him, and explained the number of the spheres, and of the heavenly bodies, their natures and operations; their opposition; their aspect, triangular, square, and sextile; their course, direct and retrograde; the twenty-fourths, and sixtieths of twenty-fourths; and other things beyond the reach of reason.

There was also among those philosophers one very skilled in treating of natural science, and he asked the Lord Jesus whether he had studied medicine. And he, in reply, explained to him physics and metaphysics, hyperphysics and hypophysics, the powers likewise and humours of the body, and the effects of the same; also the number of members and bones, of veins, arteries, and nerves; also the effect of heat and dryness, of cold and moisture, and what these give rise to; what was the operation of the soul upon the body, and what its perceptions and powers; what was the operation of the faculty of speech, of anger, of desire; lastly, their conjunction and disjunction; and other things beyond the reach of any created intellect. Then that philosopher rose up, and adored the Lord Jesus, and said: O Lord from this time I will be thy disciple and slave.

While they were speaking to each other of these and other things, the Lady Mary came, after having gone about seeking him for three days along with Joseph. She therefore, seeing him sitting among the teachers, asking them questions, and answering in his turn, said to him: My son, why hast thou treated us thus? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee with great trouble. But he said: Why do you seek me? Do you not know that I ought to occupy myself in my father's house? But they did not understand the words that he spoke to them. Then those teachers asked Mary whether he were her son; and when she signified that he was, they said: Blessed art thou, O Mary, who hast brought forth such a son. And returning with them to Nazareth, he obeyed them in all things. And his mother kept all these words of his in her heart. And the Lord Jesus advanced in stature, and in wisdom, and in favour with God and man.

And from this day he began to hide his miracles and mysteries and

secrets, and to give attention to the law, until he completed his thirtieth year, when his Father publicly declared him at the Jordan, by the voice sent down from heaven: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; the Holy Spirit being present in the form of a white dove.[51]

There can be little question that the later writer, despite his clumsiness and artificial script, understood far better than did the artist Hoffman the essential nature of the Lucan story, in its presentation, not of a respectful little boy, awed by his elders, and thrilled at the thought that he is now "a son of the law," but rather of a unique child, wise beyond his years, aware of his vocation in life, and asking his questions quite as a full grown Socrates might have done, or as Jesus himself was later to do. The apocryphon also reveals that other tendency universal in these writings and already commented upon in this essay: the utilization of details and hints from other contexts in the earlier writings to adorn old stories or to serve as the core of new ones.

Thus the Transfiguration story serves as the setting for the Apocalypse of Peter — at least for the fragment of it which we have. Here it is definitely a post-crucifixion story, as it may well have been in its form known to Mark, and the *three* disciples are now replaced by *all* the disciples. In the Apocalypse of Paul, the enigmatic word in II Cor. 12:1 ff. is freed from any possible ambiguity — "Now while *I* was in the body, wherein I was caught up into the third heaven, the word of the Lord came unto me saying . . ." [52] and made the setting for the personally conducted tour of hell upon which Paul embarks, even as had Peter in the writing just referred to, and upon which the Apocalypse of Paul is clearly dependent.

The curious story of the election of Jesus as a priest to fill the vacancy caused by the decease of one of the two and twenty who ministered in the temple [53] may safely be regarded as simply an

[51] Arabic Gospel of the Infancy 50–54 (The Anti-Nicene Fathers [Edinburgh, 1870], pp. 123 f.).

[52] Apoc. of Paul 3.

[53] "Being the same in number as the letters in their alphabet." This curious statement apparently reflects the *twenty-four* courses into which the priests were divided and which corresponded in number with the Greek author's alphabet. His twenty-four may well have been subsequently "corrected" to twenty-two by a copyist to make it conform to the Hebrew alphabet.

This story is found in the apocryphal fragment, How Jesus Christ was made a

irresponsible and overliteral bit of haggada in consequence of the portrayal of Christ as a "high priest" in Hebrews, perhaps aided by an unwarranted mediaeval deduction from the story in Luke 4:16–20, where Christ was handed the scriptures in the synagogue at Nazareth.

So one could go on endlessly. Every detail in the gospel story was a sure starting point for some imaginative expansion; every silence a challenge to ingenuity. Nameless figures in incidents speedily lose their anonymity — to wit, the woman with the issue of blood, who becomes transformed into Veronica who was to play no mean part in the later hagiography. Pilate of sheer necessity becomes a figure of no little prominence. Not only the so-called Acts of Pilate but correspondence between himself and Tiberius was inevitable.

The popular and loose statement that Jesus is said never to have written anything is far from the truth as every student of these later byways knows full well. The reference in the story of the woman taken in adultery — itself an intrusion into the Gospel of John, probably from the lost Gospel according to the Hebrews — to Jesus writing in the sand was itself to arouse much speculation. Jerome [54] hazarded the guess that what he wrote was the list of sins committed by her accusers; Ambrose [55] thought he wrote the words of Jeremiah 22:29 ("O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of Jehovah"). The famous correspondence between Jesus and Abgarus the toparch, preserved by Eusebius,[56] is too familiar to need more than mention. But these scarcely scratch the surface. He is said to have left behind him at his ascension no less than twenty-seven books (the correspondence in number with the books of our canonical New Testament is scarcely accidental). Augustine [57] mentions books on magic said to have been given by Jesus to Peter and Paul just before his ascension. Legends are common in the Mohammedan world that Christ wrote the original gospel. This was taken up into heaven and

---

Priest, in the Lexicon of Suidas. See J. deQ. Donehoo, The Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ, pp. 189 f.

[54] Adv. Pelag. ii, 17.

[55] Epist. xxv, 4; cf. Epist. xxvi, 13 f.

[56] Eusebius, H. E. i, 13, 6–10.

[57] De Cons. Evang. i, 9(14)–10(16).

later appeared in corrupted form in our present gospels or led the apostles to produce forged copies to supplant it.[58] Nor should we fail to mention the curious Letter of Christ concerning Sunday which has often been printed and which was said to have fallen out of heaven. Its list of woes for those who profane the day may well prove of scant interest save perhaps to the Lord's Day League.

In a paper already too long only the barest mention can be made of the welter of other writings that came to be produced in subsequent years. Despite their manifest differences — superficial and more substantial alike — they all are due to one common interest: the desire to find answers to questions inevitable when the holy writings were being searched and squeezed dry for more detail.

A brief word must be said regarding the "passion gospels." There are many such. The most influential appear to have been: the Gospel of Peter, already referred to in an earlier page, and which was highly regarded by many an earlier Christian until it fell under the ban because of its docetic intent; the Gospel of Nicodemus and/or the Acts of Pilate with its many versions and appendices, the Gospel of Bartholomew, and perhaps the Book of the Resurrection of Christ.

They too were inevitable. No sooner had the Gospel of Mark appeared, with an ending as abrupt as was its beginning, than steps were taken to remedy the seeming lack. Thus the magnificent close of this work, so portentous in its eloquent silence, gave way to the attempts to make explicit what was there so effectively implicit. Matthew, Luke, John — all three of them show the start of the process. But they were but dim wicks in comparison with the lurid flames of some of these later productions. One thing, however, stands out clearly. In the later "passion gospels" there is little or no indication of tradition other than what is hinted or developed in the canonical writings. Instead these hints are amplified and embellished with imagination unhampered by any restrictions such as sources might enforce.

And this is all the more surprising since the evidence would seem plain that in the early church there were many resurrection

[58] See Donehoo, op. cit., pp. 274 f.

stories current which have not come down to us. Paul's all-famous catalogue in I Corinthians 15 suggests that several such, unknown to us, were know to him and presumably to his readers. Nor is it likely that his list was exhaustive. Some of them may well have become transformed into incidents read back into the ministry. Among such the Transfiguration, the Lucan story of the call of Peter, not improbably the story of Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, may be listed.[59] It would be natural to wonder if some of the other primitive legends had not found their resting place in the later apocrypha. But examination of them makes a decisive No to such a query almost certain. There is in them no trace of what may be legitimately regarded as early tradition. Instead they are simply the imaginative development of the stories told or hinted at in the pages of our New Testament.

Thus we may end this rambling walk in the thickets and swamps of the literary yesteryears with at least one discovery sure. All these writings are palpably secondary, showing no use or knowledge of traditions or other materials outside our more sedate and long-established books. But that is not all. They are effective witnesses to the fact that what they have done, often in a crude and even repulsive way, our earlier gospels had done too. As soon as writings come to be regarded as authoritative and definitive, there will of necessity be the desire to read between the lines, to discover and to make explicit what was there implicit. The whole rabbinical literature is an impressive example of this inevitable consequence. It is said that the second-century Jewish teacher, Akiba, was so proficient in this ancient art of making the implicit explicit, of finding revelations in the most unlikely places, that Moses was amazed as he sat invisible in a back seat in Akiba's classroom to hear the learned scholar find matter in his law of which he himself had never dreamed.[60] The story is timeless, and with minor superficial alterations of names and places may well seem to the student of Christian literature — canonical, apocryphal, and hagiographic — not inept.

[59] See "The Date of Peter's Confession" in Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends, edited by R. P. Casey and others, pp. 116–122.

[60] Menahot 29b.

And with its recognition comes a sobering thought. With rare exceptions all this was done in good faith. The several authors would have been scandalized at the thought that they were guilty of introducing anything alien, even anything new. Instead they were merely making clear and recognizable what was truly there. But they were wrong. All expansion, all making explicit what is implicit, all interpretation — which so often means a reading out of what the later writer *thinks* he sees already written in — is fraught with peril, for it is so likely to result in obscuring and perverting the original meaning and emphasis. It is very easy to see the peril; it is very hard to avoid it.

THE ICONS BEFORE ICONOCLASM

NORMAN H. BAYNES
London

"The feeling against ikon-worship suddenly burst out in the earlier part of the eighth century when the iconoclastic (ikon-smashing) emperors of Constantinople tried to suppress the practice by force." So wrote Edwyn Bevan in an admirable essay on Idolatry.[1] And from modern accounts of the iconoclast movement one does generally get the impression that after the violent challenge of Epiphanius in the fourth century — when he tore down a pictured curtain which hung in a church[2] — the East Roman world had accepted without protest and without question the widespread cult of the icon, while the policy of iconoclast emperors appears as a sudden breach with a universally recognized tradition. But is such an impression justified? When we put together such fragmentary pieces of evidence as we possess is it not rather probable that there was a continuous questioning of the legitimacy of the cult? May not the part played by the icon in the life and religious usage of the Byzantine world have been subjected to the constant criticism of pagans, Jews and even of Christians? And if this is so, it may help us to understand somewhat more clearly the primary motives which inspired the policy of the iconoclast rulers. It may be worth while to consider the evidence afresh since it has been increased by two recent publications.

In 1938 Franz Diekamp published[3] a fragment from the *συμμικτὰ ζητήματα* — the "Vermischte Untersuchungen" — of Hypatius of Ephesus contained in the Codex Parisinus 1115 ann. 1276. fol. 254^{v}–255^{v}. These "Mixed Enquiries" were addressed to Julian, bishop of Atramution (in western Asia Minor), a suf-

[1] The Edinburgh Review, vol. 243, No. 496 (April 1926), pp. 253–272.

[2] I accept the authenticity of the Epiphanian documents. For a criticism of the argument of G. Ostrogorsky, Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites (Historische Untersuchungen, Heft 5) Breslau, 1929 see Franz Dölger, Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, August 1929, pp. 353–372.

[3] In his Analecta Patristica (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 117), Rome, Pont. Inst. Orientalium Studiorum, 1938, pp. 109–153, text at pp. 127–129.

fragan bishopric of Ephesus. This fragment is from chapter 5 of the first book of the work and concerns τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις οἴκοις — "the things in the holy churches." This text has not, apparently, attracted any attention from scholars, yet it is of considerable interest since Hypatius of Ephesus was a prominent champion of Chalcedonian orthodoxy in the reign of Justinian. Julian of Atramution was troubled by the scriptural prohibition of the making of images and by the command to destroy such images when they had been made. He will allow representations (γραφάς) in the churches but none on wood or stone and no sculpture. These γραφάι may be on the door-curtains (ἐπὶ θύραις: I suppose this is how the words must be translated), but no more is permissible. In his reply Hypatius urges that we must consider the reason for the Old Testament prohibition, and at the same time we must seek to understand why the making of sacred things (τὰ ἱερά) is allowed as it is at present. Since some, as sacred Scripture says, thought that the Godhead (τὸ θεῖον) was like gold and silver and stones and graven works of art, and since they made according to their own pleasure material gods and worshipped the creature rather than the creator, God rejected their altars and their idols (Hypatius quotes Romans 1^{25}, Deut. 7^{5}, 4^{15-16}, Ps. 71^{19}), for nothing of all the things that are is like or equal to or the same as the holy Trinity and the Maker and Cause of all things. But we direct that the unspeakable and incomprehensible "philanthropy" (φιλανθρωπία) of God towards us and the sacred images of the saints shall be glorified in sacred representations (γράμμασι), though we ourselves have no pleasure at all in anything formed (πλάσει) or any representation (γραφῇ). But we allow simpler and immature folk to have these as being fitted to their natural development, that thus they may learn through the eye by means adapted to their comprehension. For we have found that often and in many cases both old and new divine commands have made concessions to the weak to secure their salvation. Hypatius instances the hierophant Moses who at God's prompting had been his people's legislator and yet had been bidden to make the images of the Cherubim. "And in many other cases we see the divine wisdom (τὴν θεολογίαν) with "philanthropy" (φιλανθρωπίᾳ) for man's salvation releasing the strict-

ness of the law to benefit the souls of those who still need to be led by the hand." It is the care which guided the magi by a star and which led Israel away from idolatrous sacrifices to sacrifice to God. Therefore we, too, allow material ornament in our churches, not as though we thought that God was a god of gold and silver and silken vestments and vessels adorned with precious stones but making a concession so that each order of the faithful may be led by the hand in a way which is proper to itself and so brought to the Godhead. Thus of these, too, some will be led by the hand to spiritual beauty (*ἐπὶ τὴν νοητὴν εὐπρέπειαν*) and from the many lights in our churches to the spiritual and immaterial light.

And some of those who have studied the higher life (*τὴν ὑψηλοτέραν ζωὴν φιλοσοφησάντων*) have learned that worship in the spirit can be offered in every place and that it is holy souls which are God's temples. . . . So then we in our churches do not remove the sacred objects, but to the immature we stretch out a helping hand; we do not allow them to remain untaught concerning the more perfect doctrines, but them, too, we hold in the knowledge that the Godhead is not the same as any created thing nor is it equal or like to any such thing.

"As for ourselves we have no delight in the icons" — did that sixth century view persist among the bishops of Asia Minor? And if it did, it can readily be understood that any general cult of the icons in such extreme forms as later appear in the apologies of the iconodules would seem dangerous and a wrongful use of a practice which was tolerated only in the interest of the weaker members of the church. Here is an attitude which may help to explain the action of those bishops of Asia Minor who in the eighth century inaugurated the iconoclast movement.[4]

Through the sixth century protest of Julian of Atramution we can observe the Christian criticism of the place taken by the icons in the service of the church. We tend, however, to forget that not all the East Romans had been converted to the imperial faith. And in a fragment from St. Symeon's work on the Sacred Images [5]

[4] See G. Ostrogorsky, Les Débuts de la Querelle des Images, Mélanges Charles Diehl, vol. 1, pp. 235–255.

[5] P.G. 86b col. 3220 (P.G. = Migne, Patrologia Graeca).

we find the pagan argument that the Christians, too, through their obeisance to the icons were praying to lifeless idols. It could not have been easy for the Christians to refute the charge. The pagans, it is said, traduced the Christians and gave birth to heresies; [6] what those heresies were we are not told; did pagan criticism lead to the rejection of the use of the icons? A passage from the work of John, Bishop of Salonica [7] is in its argument unexpected. The Christians, says the bishop, do not give corporeal forms to powers which have no body; the icons of Christ through the effect of the Incarnation represent God as seen on earth "and not as He is conceived in His divine nature" (*καὶ οὐχ ὡς νοεῖται φύσει θεός*). This the pagans — surely surprisingly — were prepared to admit; granted, they said, that you can represent One made Man, what of the angels pictured on the icons as human beings though the Christians regarded them as spiritual and incorporeal (*νοεροὺς καὶ ἀσωμάτους*)? And to this objection the Christians replied that the angels were not completely incorporeal (*ἀσώματοι*) as the pagans contended, they are of the air or of fire and their bodies are very fine. Angels are localized, they have appeared in bodily form to those whose eyes God opened and are therefore rightly so painted as spiritual created beings and ministers of God (*κτίσματα νοερὰ καὶ λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ*). It would seem that the essential point for the pagans was to establish that the Christian use of the icons was idolatrous: the Christian reverencing the Cross was a worshipper of a wooden god; if he worshipped the Cross he ought to worship asses. The Christian replied that no demon trembled when he saw asses.[8] And under Justinian pagans were given a short shrift: they were arrested and carried in public procession, their books were burned and so were their "icons and images of their foul Gods" (*εἰκόνες τῶν μυσαρῶν θεῶν καὶ ἀγάλματα*).[9] Did pagan criticism of the icons raise doubts of their legitimacy in the minds of the Christians? Our fragmentary sources give us no answer to such a question.

[6] Byzantion 17 (1944–45), p. 66.
[7] Mansi, vol. 13, col. 164–65.
[8] Pseudo-Athanasios P.G. 28, col. 621–624.
[9] Malalas (Bonn ed.), p. 491 [19–20].

It is strange that, so far as I know, no study has appeared of the appeal of Leontius, Bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus, directed to the Jews who charged the Christians with having introduced idolatry into the Church. That appeal we possess only in fragmentary form,[10] but it is of great interest as giving us the defence of the icons as it was formulated in the early years of the seventh century. Leontius knew Egypt well, he wrote the biography of the Patriarch St. John the Almsgiver; [11] and from the first many Jews had settled in Alexandria. It may well have been in Alexandria that Leontius composed his apology against the Jews (*ἀπολογία κατὰ Ἰουδαίων*). We have in the Pratum Spirituale of John Moschus an account of Cosmas, a scholasticus of Alexandria, who possessed a large library — he was *πολύβιβλος ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς ἐν Αλεξανδρείᾳ ὄντας* (Pratum Spirituale ch. 172, P.G. 87, 3, col. 3040 D) and generously lent his books to all who wished to read them. John Moschus went to see him daily and always found him either reading or writing against the Jews, for he was passionately desirous to convert them to the truth, "And he often sent me to the Jews that I might discuss with them on the evidence of the Scripture." This is the background which must be kept in mind as one reads the appeal of Leontius. A summary of that appeal (so far as we possess it) is the simplest way of illustrating its significance.[12]

The Jews took their stand upon the God-given Law, and for the Christians also that Law formed part of their sacred scriptures since they had laid claim to the Old Testament as their own and refused to follow Marcion in rejecting the earlier revelation. And that Law had expressly ordained "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or likeness of any thing that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath or that is in the water under the earth, thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them" (Exodus 20^{4-5}). "You shall make you no idols nor graven image . . . neither shall ye set up any image of stone in your land to bow down unto it" (Levit. 26^{1}; cf. Deut. 5^{8}).

[10] I do not understand the relation between the text cited from Mansi vol. 13, P.G. 93, col. 1597–1609 and the extracts quoted by John of Damascus P.G. 94.

[11] Translated in E. Dawes and N. H. Baynes, Three Byzantine Saints, Blackwell, Oxford, 1948.

[12] P.G. 93, col. 1597–1609.

Such was the tradition; but, Leontius argued, there was another legal tradition: God had said to Moses that he should fashion two Cherubim [13] graven in gold (Exodus 25^{18}), while God showed to Ezekiel a temple with forms of palms and lions and men and with Cherubim from pavement to roof (Ezekiel 41^{18}). Thus had God revoked his own ordinance. "If you wish to condemn me," wrote Leontius, "on account of images (εἰκόνες), then you must condemn God for ordering them to be made." [14] And though God gave no instructions concerning the adornment of His temple yet on the legal precedent of God's command to Moses (ἐκ νόμου λαβὼν τὸν τύπον) [15] Solomon filled the building with lions and bulls and palm-trees and men in bronze and with carved and molten images. It was important for Leontius to prove that the Christians were not innovators, they were but maintaining a tradition derived from the scriptures which were sacred alike to Jew and Christian; [16] elsewhere in a passage cited by John of Damascus (P.G. 94 col. 1273) he meets an objection that might be raised by the Jews. "It may be objected," Leontius writes, "that all those things which were in the tent of witness God ordered to be placed there and I reply that Solomon made many different things in the temple, carved and molten things which God had not ordered him to make nor were they amongst the things which were in the tent of witness nor were they in the temple which God showed to Ezekiel, but Solomon was not condemned for this, for he made these shapes to the glory of God just as we do." [17]

Others, it may be noted, carried the argument still further. Thus Hieronymus, a presbyter of Jerusalem, suggested that God had allowed each nation (ἔθνος) to worship its own gods through things made by man in order that no one might be able to raise objection to the Christian use of the Cross and the Christian obeisance (προσκύνησις) before the icons. So the Jews made their obeisance (προσκύνησις) before the ark of the covenant,

[13] For the argument derived from God's direction concerning the Cherubim see P. — supra.

[14] Cf. P.G. 94, col. 1384 A–B.

[15] Cf. John of Damascus De Imaginibus Oratio, III, P.G. 94, col. 1384 A–B quoting Leontius: Solomon ἐκ νόμου λαβὼν τὸ τύπωμα.

[16] Cf. ibid., col. 1381 s.f. νομικὴ γὰρ αὕτη ἡ παράδοσις καὶ οὐχ ἡμετέρα.

[17] Cf. Byzantion 17(1944–45), p. 59 "Et Dieu ne désapprouva pas et il l'appela le temple de son nom."

the Cherubim and the tables of the Law, although Moses was nowhere bidden to do obeisance to or to reverence (*προσκυνεῖν* or *ἀσπάζεσθαι*) these things (P.G. 40 col. 865) and the same view is expressed in a fragment cited in a note, ibid.

The reply of the Jew was that these images, permitted to be made by God, were not to be adored as gods but served only to remind us. "Well said," responded the Christian, "the same is true of our icons." [18] Elsewhere Leontius states that the godless (*πανάθεοι*) call the Christians idolaters and worshippers of wooden gods (*ξυλοθέους*). In P.G. 94 col. 1384 B he rejects the charge with scorn: "We do not make obeisance to the nature of the wood but we revere and do obeisance to Him who was crucified on the Cross" ibid. 1384 D. "We do not say to the Cross nor to the icons of the saints 'You are my God.' For they are not our gods, but opened books to remind us of God and to His honour set in the churches and adored" ibid. col. 1276 A. "If we worshipped the wood of the image, we should not burn the icon when the representation grew faint. When the two beams of the Cross are joined together I adore the figure because of the Christ who on the Cross was crucified, but if the beams are separated, I throw them away and burn them." This argument is adopted by other writers.[19]

One who receives an order from the Emperor and kisses the seal does not honor the paper but gives to the Emperor his obeisance and respect; [20] and in the same way, when we see the representation of Christ, through it we hail and do obeisance to the Crucified. Just as children, if their father is away, cherish his staff or his chair so we cherish the places which Christ visited, Nazareth or the Jordan, and remember his friends, the saints

[18] This theme of the function of the icons to keep alive men's memory is constant, cf. e.g., the citations of Leontius in P.G. 94 col. 1276 A *ἀνάμνησις* and in ibid., 1385 A; *ὑπάμνησις* in 1384 B and P.G. 28 col. 621 D. John Bishop of Thessalonica in Mansi 13 col. 164 on the icons of the saints *εἰς τὸ μεμνῆσθαι αὐτῶν καὶ τιμᾶν αὐτοὺς . . . ὡς γνησίους δούλους καὶ φίλους θεοῦ καὶ παρρησίαν ἔχοντας πρεσβεύειν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.* Of the icons we read in Quaestiones; ad Antiochum, Ducem P.G. 28 col. 621 *οὕσπερ δι' ὑπόμνησιν καὶ μόνον ἐντυποῦμεν καὶ οὐ δι'ἕτερον τρόπον* cf. Stephen of Bostra P.G. 94 col. 1376 B–D.

[19] Cf. Les Trophées de Damas, ed. G. Bardy, Patrologia Orientalis Tome 15, Fasc. 2, Paris 1920, p. 245 (75) — Isaiah 44^{14-17} quoted; Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem P.G. 28 col. 621 B and the fragment ibid. col. 709 A.

[20] Cf. P.G. 94 col. 1384 D.

and the martyrs. And on account of Christ and of those things which are Christ's we figure his sufferings in our churches and houses, in our market places and on our garments — everywhere — so that through seeing them constantly we may be warned that we should not forget. Then turning to the Jew, Leontius says:

"You do obeisance to the book of the Law, but you do not make obeisance to parchments and ink but to the words of God contained therein. And it is thus that I do obeisance to the icon of God, for when I hold the lifeless representation of Christ in my hands [21] through it I seem to hold and to do obeisance to the Christ. As Jacob kissed the bloody coat of Joseph and felt that he held him in his arms, so Christians think that holding the image they hold Christ or His apostles and martyrs.

You say that there must be no obeisance paid to anything made by human hands or created. But haven't you, when wife or children have died, taken some garment or ornament of theirs and kissed it and shed tears over it and were not condemned for doing so? You did not do obeisance to the garments as to God; through your kisses you did but show your longing for those who once had worn them. Fathers and children, sinners and created beings as they are, we often greet them and no one condemns us, for we do not greet them as gods, but through our kisses we express our natural love for them. As I have said many times, in every greeting and every obeisance it is the purpose of the action which is in question.[22] And if you accuse me of doing obeisance to the wood of the Cross as though it were God why do you not say the same of the staff of Joseph? [23] Abraham did obeisance to infamous men who sold a sepulchre, and went on his knees before them, but not as though they were gods. Jacob blessed the idolater Pharaoh and did obeisance to Esau, but not as though they were gods. Do you see how many salutations and obeisances I have adduced out of the Scriptures and all without blame?"

"You call us idolaters when it was Christian saints and martyrs who destroyed the temples of the idolaters." [24] Leontius accuses the Jews of blindness because they fail to realize that through the relics of the

[21] Cf. *τῇ σαρκί* P.G. ibid. 1385 B and the fragment P.G. 28 col. 709.

[22] Cf. P.G. 94 col. 1385 B *ὁ σκοπὸς ἐξετάζεται.*

[23] P.G. 93 col. 1601 *διὰ τί οὐκ ἐγκαλεῖς τῷ Ἰακὼβ προσκυνήσαντι ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου τοῦ Ἰωσήφ.* Jacob did not make obeisance to the wood but through the wood to Joseph. Hebrews, 11,21. Cf. F. Nau, La Didaskalie de Jacob, Patrologia Orientalis vol. 8, fasc. 5 p. 740 (30), Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem P.G. 28 col. 621.

[24] Cf. P.G. 94 col. 1385 D.

martyrs and through the icons demons are put to flight, and yet foul men pervert and mock and laugh at such things as these. Often blood will gush forth from the icons and from the relics of the martyrs and foolish folk, though they see this, are not persuaded; they treat the miracles as myths and fables. As Leontius writes in another fragment "If the bones of the just are impure, how was it that the bones of Jacob and Joseph were carried back with all honour from Egypt? How was it that a dead man touching the bones of Elisha straightway stood up? And if God works miracles through bones, it is clear that he can do the same through icons and stones and many other things." [25]

With this belief in the cogency of the argument from miracle may be compared a passage from the Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem: "Let those who refuse to do obeisance to the Cross and the icons explain how it is that the holy icons have often poured forth streams of myrrh by the power of the Lord, and how it is that a lifeless stele when it has received a blow has miraculously given forth blood as though it were a living body. Let them say how it is that from tombs and relics and icons demons are often driven howling away." [26] In Les Trophées de Damas it is stated that the sick whether they be believers or unbelievers take their seat beside the coffins of the saints and are healed.[27]

And daily, Leontius continues, almost throughout the inhabited world unholy and lawless men, idolaters and murderers, adulterers and robbers are suddenly smitten in their consciences through Christ and His Cross, say farewell to the whole world and give themselves to the practice of virtue. Tell me, how can we be idolaters who pay our homage (προσκυνεῖν) and do honor to the bones, the dust, the clothes, the blood and the tombs of those who refused to sacrifice to idols?

The Christian brings to the Creator, the Lord and Maker of all things, his adoration and worship through heaven and earth and sea, through stone and wood, through relics and churches, through the Cross, through angels and through mankind. For creation cannot itself directly worship its Maker, but through me the heavens declare the glory of God, through me the moon

[25] P.G. 94 col. 1272 C–D.

[26] P.G. 28 col. 621 C. For a story of a demon and the icon of the Virgin ibid.

[27] Les Trophées de Damas, ed Bardy. Patrologia Orientalis vol. 15, Fasc. 2 p. 273 (103) and cf. ibid. p. 272 (102).

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

worships God, through me the stars, through me the waters, the showers and the dew, through me all creation worship and glorify God.

When a good king has made for himself a rich and elaborate crown all those who are truly loyal to the king pay their respect and honor to the crown, but it is not the gold or the pearls that they honor but the head of the king and his skilful hands which have fashioned the crown. So with the Christians: whenever they pay their respects to the representations of the Cross and to icons it is not to wood or stone, not to gold or the perishable icon, not to the coffin or the relics that they bring their worship, but through these they bring their respect and their worship. For the honor paid to His saints courses back (*ἀνατρέχει*) to Himself. Thus it is that men destroying or insulting icons of the Emperor are punished with extreme severity as having insulted the Emperor himself and not merely the painted board. Man made after God's image is God's icon indwelt by the Holy Spirit. It is right therefore that I should honor and make obeisance (*προσκυνεῖν*) to the icon of the servants of God and glorify the dwelling of the Holy Spirit.

If the Jews accuse the Christians of idolatry they should be covered with shame, for they did obeisance to their own kings and the kings of other nations. Everywhere the Christians have armed themselves against the idols: against the idols we sing our hymns, against the idols we write, against the idols and the demons we pray. Supposing that an idolater had come into your temple and seen the two sculptured Cherubim and had blamed the Jews as being themselves idolaters what, asks Leontius, could you reply? For the Christian the Cross and the icons are not gods: they remind us of Christ and His saints that we should do them honor: they are there to beautify our churches; and he who pays his worship to Christ's Mother carries the honor to Him and he who honors the apostle honors Him who sent him forth.[28]

If then prophets and righteous men bowed to the earth before idolaters because of services rendered why do you blame me when I bow before the Cross and before representations of the saints through whom from God I receive ten thousand good things?

[28] Cf. P.G. 94 col. 1276 A.

On this appeal of Leontius Dr. E. J. Martin writes (A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy, p. 141) "The views . . . are so complete an anticipation of the Iconoclastic struggle and its very arguments that the authenticity of all the passages attributed to Leontius must be gravely suspect." He conjectures that Leontius is really the champion of orthodoxy, George of Cyprus. This judgment seems to me perverse. I am struck by the great skill with which Leontius presents his case: the whole argument is based throughout on the Old Testament, the common ground of Jew and Christian. Leontius may have known the theological justification, deduced from the Incarnation, of the icons of Christ, but he makes no use of it: it would have had no cogency for the Jews. "The principle stands that we must either not argue with a man at all or we must argue on his grounds and not ours." [29] Leontius knows St. Basil's doctrine that the honor paid to the icon passes to the prototype (ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει); he may well have known that key-text, but nowhere in the fragments which we possess does he cite a Christian Father of the Church. The only distinctively Christian argument which he employs is the evidence of those miracles performed through the icons for which the Jew was in duty bound to furnish an explanation, since Leontius was persuaded that the fact of miracle was incontrovertibly established. The plea of Leontius is thus widely different from the later Iconodule propaganda and deserves close study.[30] Indeed it may be suggested that the repetition, in a series of works against the Jews, of the arguments of Leontius in defence of the icons was indirectly intended to meet the scruples of Christians impressed by the Jewish contention. It is to be observed that it is a Christian who asks Antiochus for a justification of the disregard of the Old Testament prohibition of images.[31]

It is not necessary to consider in detail that series of works against the Jews, since the argument concerning the icons for the most part does but reproduce the plea of Leontius. Thus in

[29] G. K. Chesterton, St. Thomas Aquinas, 1933, p. 110.

[30] It would, for example, be of interest to know whether there are parallels to the view of Leontius that the world of nature needs the help of man before it can worship its Creator.

[31] P.G. 28 col. 621.

Les Trophées de Damas the Jewish charge of idolatry is repeated — the Christians are falling back into old pagan practices (*τῇ παλαιᾷ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν συνηθείᾳ*),[32] they do obeisance to things made by human hands (*χειροποίητα καὶ κτιστὰ πράγματα*). The Christian in reply points to the ark of the covenant, to Moses and the (second) tables of the Law and to the Cherubim. The book of the Law is brought from the synagogue and the Jews do obeisance to it and so prove the Christian's argument.

A. C. McGiffert's edition of the Dialogue of Papiscus and Philo[33] (Marburg, 1889) is not accessible to me, but the text of the curious brief section on the Cross and the icons is cited by F. Nau in his edition of the Didascalia of Jacob.[34] This, again, only repeats arguments which we have met with previously: the Jew asking why the order which was given by God forbidding to do obeisance to things made of wood (*μὴ προσκυνεῖν ξύλοις*) was disregarded by the Christians in their use of the Cross and of icons, and the Christian replying Why do you do obeisance to the book of the Law and why did Jacob do obeisance on the top of Joseph's staff (*ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄκρου τῆς ῥάβδου τοῦ Ἰωσήφ*)? In respect of the book of the Law the Jew answers that he does not do obeisance to the nature of the skins but to the meaning of the words of the Law, while Jacob did not do obeisance to the wood of the staff, but he honored Joseph who held it.

In the summary of Leontius' argument references have been given to parallels in the Pseudo-Athanasian Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem P.G. 28, Quaestio 39, col. 621; there is no fresh development. A fragment added to the Quaestiones ibid. col. 709 does but give a variant to the text of Leontius: "For if Christ is not present to my lips in His body, nevertheless with heart and mind I am present with Christ in the spirit." It is interesting in such passages as this to catch an echo of the emotion which inspired the cult of the icon: in the Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem: "We make our obeisance to express the attitude and the love of our souls (*τὴν σχέσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν*) for

[32] Les Trophées de Damas, ed. G. Bardy, Patrologia Orientalis vol. 15, p. 245.

[33] On this dialogue see A. Lukyn Williams, Adversus Judaeos, Cambridge, 1935, pp. 169–174.

[34] La Didascalie de Jacob, Patrologia Orientalis vol. 8, 5, p. 740.

those represented in the icon,[35] or "to show our longing (πόθος) for them just as we greet fathers and friends; [36] through the Cross we express the true attitude of our souls (τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν γνησίαν διάθεσιν) towards the Crucified.[37] The very simplicity of the wording seems to carry with it an assurance of genuine feeling.

There remain to be considered two documents recently translated from the Armenian, a seventh century apology for the icons and a letter of the vardapet John Mayragometsi taken from the history of Moses Kaghankavatsi.[38] The apology begins on lines which must have become traditional: the Old Testament prohibition of images is met with references to the Cherubim, and to Solomon's Temple — God did not disapprove Solomon's initiative, He called the Temple the Temple of His name. The Christian paintings are not the true God, but we paint them in the name of God "tel qu'il apparut" — a precise parallel to the passage quoted from John, bishop of Salonica (supra p. 96). The writer of the apology is addressing Christians and therefore he can proceed to quote from John Chrysostom, Severian of Gabala and Gregory the Illuminator, and can translate from Eusebius his account of the statue of the woman with an issue of blood at Paneas. Heretics consider the icons to be idle, for they can neither speak nor understand: "What of the ark," is the reply, "when it overturned Dagon?" And the Cross raised the dead in the Holy City and still performs numberless miracles down to our own day — the Cross which is the pride of angels, the salvation of men and the terror of the demons. But the special interest of this apology lies in the statement that in Armenia two monks are preaching the destruction of the icons — "l'impie et l'égaré Thaddée et Isaïe et leurs compagnons qui entraînèrent à leur

[35] P.G. 28 col. 621 B.

[36] Ibid.

[37] P.G. 40 col. 865. It may be noted that the cult of the Cross was not extended to embrace other objects connected with the passion — the ass, the holy lance, the sponge, the reed — and when Christians asked the reason for this ἅγια γὰρ εἰσι καὶ ταῦτα καθὰ καὶ ὁ σταυρός it was not easy to find a satisfactory answer, see P.G. 28 col. 624, Trophées de Damas p. 249.

[38] Sirarpie der Nersessian, Une Apologie des Images du septième Siècle, Byzantion 17 (1944–45), pp. 58–87. By her translation of these texts and her fully documented commentary Miss der Nersessian has rendered a great service to those of us who cannot read Armenian works.

suite un grand nombre de personnes," and from the letter we learn that when the leaders of the movement were arrested and were asked why they refused to accept the image of the incarnate God they replied that that was alien to the commandments "et c'est l'oeuvre des idolâtres qui adorent toutes les créatures; quant à nous nous ne nous prosternons pas devant les images car nous n'en avons pas reçu l'ordre des saintes écritures. Alors, leur ayant parlé des images de l'autel de Moïse, des diverses sculptures du temple de Salomon, et expliqué que nous représentons les mêmes choses dans nos églises; leur ayant donc dit ceci, et d'autres paroles semblables, nous corrigeâmes leur erreur."

Thus the story which begins with the scruples of Julian ends with an active Iconoclast movement in Armenia and Albania. I would suggest that too little attention has been paid to this evidence as forming the background of imperial policy. Need we doubt that Iconoclasm was primarily religious in its inspiration? Is there any reason to believe that "Iconoclasm was but an outgrowth and indeed the climax of the caesaropapistic theory and practice of the State as represented by some of the most successful Byzantine Emperors"? [39]

[39] So Gerhart B. Ladner, Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy, Mediaeval Studies 2 (1940), Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, pp. 127–149. I prefer Louis Brehier's summing up of Les caractères généraux et la portée de la réforme iconoclaste, Revue des Cours et Conférences for 11 April 1901, pp. 226–235.

BOOK REVIEWS

BEYOND MYTHOLOGY. *By Richard W. Boynton.* Garden City, Doubleday & Company, 1951. xiv, 257 p. $3.00.

CONNAISSANCE DU TEMPS. *Par Ernest Huant.* Paris, Lethielleux, 1950. 155 p.

COSMOLOGY. *By Fernand Renoirte.* New York, Wagner, 1950. xv, 256 p. $3.50.

THE DAWN OF PHILOSOPHY. *Edited by R. F. C. Hull.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1951. xi, 333 p. $4.50.

DEUS DOMINUS. I. DE DEI EXISTENTIA. DE DEI ESSENTIA ET ATTRIBUTIS ENTITATIVIS. II. DE DIVINIS OPERATIONIBUS. *By D. Emmanuel Gisquière.* Paris, Beauchesne, 1950. 2 volumes.

DIEU. SON EXISTENCE ET SA NATURE. *Par R. Garrigou-Lagrange.* Paris, Beauchesne, 1950. Deuxième partie.

L'EPITRE DE SAINT PAUL AUX PHILIPPIENS. *Par Pierre Bonnard.*

L'EPITRE DE SAINT PAUL AUX COLOSSIENS. *Par Charles Masson.* Paris, Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950. 158 p. 9 fr. 50 suisses.

ESQISSE D'UNE DOGMATIQUE. *Par Karl Barth.* Paris, Delachaux & Nestlé, 1950. 153 p. 6 fr. 50 suisses.

ETUDES HISTORIQUES. *Par Henri Maspero.* Bibliothèque de Diffusion, tome 59. Paris, Civilisation du Sud. S. A. E. P., 1950. 270 p. 465 frs.

THE EUCHARISTIC TEACHING OF WILLIAM OCKHAM. *By Gabriel Buescher.* St. Bonaventure, N. Y., The Franciscan Institute, 1950. xxvii, 173 p. $2.00.

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF GREGORIAN CHANT. *By Lura F. Heckenlively.* Tournai, Belgium, Desclée, n.d. x, 308 p.

HAN SOM KOMMER. MESSIASFORVENTNINGEN I DET GAMLE TESTAMENT OG PA JESU TID. *Door Sigmund Mowinckel.* København, Gads, 1951. 417 p. d. Kr. 29,00.

DER HEILIGE KRIEG IM ALTEN ISRAEL. *Von Gerhard von Rad.* Zürich, Zwingli, 1951. 84 p. Fr. 7.50.

L'HOMME SELON L'APOTRE PAUL. *Par Herrade Mehl-Koehlein.* Paris, Delachaux & Niestlé, 1951. 50 p. 2 fr. 75.

DE INDULGENTIIS. TRACTUS QUOAD EARUM NATURAM ET USUM. Editio alters. *By Seraphinus de Angelis.* Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1950. xxxii, 581 pp. $2.60.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE. *By Clarence H. Brannon.* Raleigh, N. C., Graphic Press, 1950. xi, 292 p.

THE LAST WARS OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH. *By A. Malamat.* [Chicago, University of Chicago Press], 1950. 9 p. (Reprint from the Journal of Near Eastern Studies).

THE LETTERS OF SAINT ATHANSIUS CONCERNING THE HOLY SPIRIT. *Translated with introduction and notes by C. R. B. Shapland.* London, Epworth Press, [1951]. 204 p. 25/.

LIBERTE ET VALEUR. *Par Jacques Delesalle.* Louvain, Universitaires de Louvain, 1950. 239 p. $1.30.

DIE LITERARISCHE EINHEIT DES JOHANNESEVANGELIUMS. *Von Eugen Ruckstuhl.* Freiburg in der Schweiz, Paulusverlag, 1951. xvii, 289 p.

THE NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN CH'I-YING AND LAGRENÉ 1844–1846. *By Angelus Grosse-Aschoff.* St. Bonaventure, N. Y., The Franciscan Institute, 1950. 195 p. $2.00.

HET OFFERMAAL IN HET HEIDENDOM EN IN DE HEILIGE SCHRIFT. *Door Lambert Zielhuis.* Franeker, T. Wever, 1951. 200 p.

THE OLD TESTAMENT PROBLEM. A re-investigation together with two other essays. *By Edward Robertson.* Manchester University Press, 1950. ix, 238 p. 21/.

THE OLD TESTAMENT TEXT AND VERSIONS. *By Bleddyn J. Roberts.* Cardiff, University of Wales, 1951. xv, 326 p. 21s.

ORDO SABBATI SANCTI QUANDO VIGILIA PASCHALIS INSTAURATA PERAGITUR. Rome, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1951. 39 p. $.70.

PEREGRINATIO RELIGIOSA. WALLFAHRTEN IN DER ANTIKE UND DAS PILGERWESEN IN DER ALTEN KIRCHE. *Von Bernhard Kötting.* Münster, Regensberg, 1950. xxvii, 473 p. 20 DM.

DIE QUELLEN DER POLITISCHEN ETHIK DES I. KLEMENSBRIEFES. *Von Christian Eggenberger.* Zürich, Zwingli, 1951. 212 p. Fr. 11.

RECHERCHES SUR LES CONFESSIONS DE SAINT AUGUSTIN. *Par Pierre Courcelle.* Paris, de Boccard, 1950. 299 p. 850 fr.

LES RELIGIONS CHINOISES. *Par Henri Maspero.* Bibliothèque de Diffusion, tome 57. Paris, Civilisations du Sud. S. A. E. P., 1950. 255 p. 465 frs.

SIR WALTER RALEGH. A study in Elizabethan skepticism. *By Ernest A. Strathmann.* N. Y., Columbia University, 1951. ix, 292 p. $3.75.

LE TAOÏSME. *Par Henri Maspero.* Bibliothèque de Diffusion, tome 58. Paris, Civilisations du Sud, S. A. E. P., 1950. 268 p. 465 frs.

THEMES BIBLIQUES. *Par Jacques Guillet.* Paris, Aubier, 1951. 284 p. 495 fr.

THEOLOGISCHE ETHIK. *Von Helmut Thielicke.* Tübingen, Mohr, 1951. xv, 740 p. DM 38.

LE TRAVAIL DE L'HOMME ET SON OEUVRE. *Par Eduard Mauris.* Paris, Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950. 39 p. 2 fr.

VERSUCH EINER ONTOLOGIE DER PERSÖNLICHKEIT. *Von Manfred Theil.* Erster Band, Die Kategorie des Seinzusammenhanges und die Einheit des Seins. Berlin, Etc., Springer, 1950. XXIII, 635 p. DM 29.70.